

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 1.

Please replace Figure 1 on file, with the attached Replacement Sheet corresponding thereto.

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough examination of the present application. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-25 are now present in this application, of which claim 1 is independent. By this amendment, claims 1 and 6 have been amended.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings filed June 16, 2005. The Examiner states that Figure 1 should be labeled --Prior Art--.

In order to address this objection, Applicants respectfully submit that the suggestion in MPEP § 608.02(g) of the use of the phrase --Prior Art-- does not exclude the use of alternate phrases, for example, "Background Art" and "Conventional Art". These alternative phrases may be found in many U.S. Patents issued today. The intent of MPEP § 608.02(g) is to distinguish Applicants' invention from that which is not Applicants' invention. If a drawing figure illustrates only material which is known to be statutory prior art to the invention, then the use of the phrase --Prior Art-- in the drawing figure would be proper. However, if it is not clear whether such material is statutory prior art, then the use of the phrase --Prior Art-- in the drawing figures would not be proper, and a label such as "Background Art" or "Conventional Art" would be more appropriate.

Accordingly, Figure 1 has been labeled "Background Art". Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Election of Species Requirement

The Examiner previously made the Election of Species Requirement final, and had withdrawn claims 10-24 from further consideration. Applicants have not canceled these non-elected claims because each of these claims depends, either directly or indirectly, from independent generic claim 1, which is believed to be allowable. Upon allowance of independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully request examination and allowance of these withdrawn claims.

As noted previously, Applicants respectfully submit that at least dependent claim 19 and also reads on elected Species I.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over El-Hamamsy in view of Masuda. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in a cooling structure for a plasma lighting system including "a case in which inner components are mounted," and "a fan housing having at least one inlet port and at least two discharge ports having different discharge flow rates for discharging introduced external air into the case with different flow rates from each other in order to cool heat generation components in the case by introducing external air in the case, wherein a microwave generator and a bulb motor are located at one side in the case and a high voltage generator is located at the other side thereof, and the discharge port toward the microwave generator and the bulb motor has different discharge flow rate from the other discharge port toward the high voltage generator."

Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including El-Hamamsy in view of Masuda.

At the outset, Applicants note that independent claim 1 has been amended to include most of the subject matter of allowable dependent claim 6. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to include a microwave generator, a bulb motor, and a high voltage generator. Claim 1 has also been amended to require that one of the at least two discharge ports is directed towards the microwave generator and bulb motor and the other of the at least two discharge ports is directed towards the high voltage generator where the flow rates from the discharge ports are different from each other. Neither reference relied on by the Examiner were cited as providing this claimed arrangement.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including El-Hamamsy and Masuda, for the reasons explained above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 25, 8, 9 and 25, Applicants submit that these claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore these claims are allowable based on their dependence from claim 1, as well as for their additionally recited subject matter. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 6 and 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject matter in this application. However, claims 6 and 7 have not been rewritten in independent form at this time, since it is believed that independent claim 1, from which these claims depend is allowable.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad D. Wells, Registration No. 50875, at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: FEB 28 2011

CDW

Respectfully submitted,

By James T. Eller
James T. Eller, Jr.
Registration No.: 39538
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000
Attorney for Applicants

Attachment: Replacement Figure 1